	TED STATES PATENT A	and Trademark Office	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22: www.usplo.gov	OR PATENTS
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,225	02/26/2004	Hans Sjostrand	000254.00038	2834
22907 7590 09/10/2007 BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			ZHOU, YONG	
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-4051		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Wildim (0101, DC 2000) 1051			2609	
			,	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/786,225	SJOSTRAND, HANS			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Yong Zhou	2609			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tte, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Th 3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under 	is action is non-final. ance except for formal mat				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ 	awn from consideration.	·			
Application Papers					
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 February 2004</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E 	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/26/2004</u> . 1.5. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Office	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070823			

- -

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by IETF Request for Comments 3220 (referred to as "RFC-3220" hereinafter).

Regarding **claim 1**, RFC-3220 teaches a method for decoupling a Mobile IP home network from its Mobile IP Home Agent (virtual network, p24, 2nd para., lines 1-2) with support for roaming (p6, para. before Sec 1.6, lines 3-5) on the intranet as well as the Internet, characterized in the normal operation of the IGP is assumed (router, e.g., a home agent, p9, 6th para., lines 3-5, the IGP type of routing protocols are among well known routing protocols), and that a static route for a Mobile Address aggregate is used to distribute Mobile IP addresses in the IGP (p6, para. before Sec 1.6, lines 1-3).

Regarding **claim 2**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the IGP is used for directing traffic to the HA for Mobile Clients that are roaming outside their Mobile Home Network (p10, last para., lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 3**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the proxy ARP function of the default gateway is used for directing traffic in the Mobile Home Network to the HA for

the Mobile Clients that are roaming outside their Mobile Home Network (p69, 3rd para., lines 1-3).

Regarding **claim 4**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the Mobile IP registrations are redistributed to the IGP in order to direct traffic to the HA for the Mobile Clients that are roaming outside their Mobile Home Network (p64, 6th para., lines 1-2).

Regarding **claim 5**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the traffic is directed toward

the HA instead of the Mobile Address aggregate using host routes (p42, 1st para., lines

1-2).

Regarding claim 6, RFC-3220 further teaches that the Mobile IP registrations are

redistributed to the IGP in order to direct traffic to the HA (p64, 6th para., lines 1-2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC 3220 in view of Wang (US 2004/0114559).

Regarding claim 7, RFC-3220 teaches all the limitations of claim 1.

RFC-3220 does not specifically teach that the Mobile Client deregisters over

several IP router hops to the Mobile IP Home Agent.

Wang teaches that the Mobile Client deregisters over several IP router hops to the Mobile IP Home Agent ([0033], lines 11-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify RFC-3220 invention to include the deregistration by the Mobile Client over several IP router hops to the Mobile IP Home Agent as taught by Wang to achieve predictable results of IP mobility.

Regarding **claim 8**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the Mobile Home Agent verifies that the Client is located in the Mobile Home Network by the source address of the Mobile IP registration request (p59, Sec 3.8.3.1, 6th para., line 4, and 7th para, lines 1-3).

Regarding **claim 9**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the Mobile client detects that it is in the Mobile Home Network by using DHCP options and IRDP Router Advertisements (p10, 8th para, lines 3-5, and p27, last para, lines 1-3).

5. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RFC-3220 in view of Khosravi (US Patent Application No. 2003/0039245).

Regarding claim 10, RFC-3220 teaches all the limitations of claim 1.

RFC-3220 does not specifically teach that the Home Agent utilizes an IGP route injector and MAC layer redirect per physical interface for shared deployment scenarios where an address overlap between the physical networks hosting the virtual home networks may exist.

Khosravi teaches that the Home Agent utilizes an IGP route injector and MAC layer redirect ([0042], line 12, and [0052], line 13) per physical interface for shared

deployment scenarios where an address overlap between the physical networks hosting the virtual home networks may exist.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the RFC-3220 invention to utilize the IGP route injector and MAC layer redirect as taught by Khosravi to achieve predictable results of supporting IP mobility.

Regarding **claim 11**, RFC-3220 further teaches that the Home Agent in it's home session table keep track of the interface and gateway MAC address over which the registration form the Mobile Node came (mobility binding, p54, Sec 3.8.1, 2nd para., lines 3-4) in order to allow for overlapping care-of-addresses at visited networks.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Peirce et al. (US Patent No. 6,560,217) teach a method and system of virtual home agent service using software-replicated home agents.

Brown (US Patent Application No. 2002/0165980) teaches a method and system route table minimization.

7. Any Response to this Office should be **faxed** to (571) 273-8300 or **mailed to**:

Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Page 5

> **Customer Service Window Randolph Building** 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yong Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 270-3451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Q. Tieu can be reached on (571) 272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BERNY Q. TIEU SPE/TRAINER

YΖ